

REMARKS

This response is intended as a full and complete response to the Office Action dated June 21, 2006. In view of the following amendments and discussion, the Applicants believe that all claims are in allowable form.

CLAIM REJECTIONS

35 U.S.C. §102 Claims 1-2 and 4-9

Claims 1-2 and 4-9 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by United States Publication No. 2004-0054821 published March 18, 2004 to *Warren, et al.* (hereinafter referred to as *Warren*). In response, the Applicant has amended claims 1 and 8-9 to more clearly recite certain aspects of the invention. Claim 2 is cancelled without prejudice.

Warren does not teach or suggest that a switch, when actuated in response to an event, causes information retrieved from a vessel navigation system to be stored in memory and be associated with data that includes by-catch information, as recited by claim 1. Therefore, *Warren* does anticipate claim 1, or claims 2 and 4-9 depending therefrom.

Thus, the Applicant submits that claims 1-2 and 4-9 are patentable over *Warren*. Accordingly, the Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection be withdrawn.

35 U.S.C. §102 Claims 10-15 and 18-20

Claims 10-15 and 18-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by United States Publication No. 2003-0056419 published March 27, 2003 to *Squires, et al.* (hereinafter referred to as *Squires*). In response, the Applicant has amended claims 11, 15, 18 and 20 to more clearly recite certain aspects of the invention. Claim 19 is cancelled without prejudice.

Squires does not teach or suggest associating date and vessel position with by-catch information relating to an event, as recited by claim 11. Therefore, *Squires* does anticipate claim 11, or claims 12-15, 18 and 20 depending therefrom.

Thus, the Applicant submits that claims 1-2 and 4-9 are patentable over *Warren*. Accordingly, the Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection be withdrawn.

35 U.S.C. §103 Claim 3

Claim 3 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Warren* in further view of United States Publication No. 2002-0032696 published March 14, 2002 to *Takiguchi, et al.* (hereinafter referred to as *Takiguchi*). In response, the Applicant has amended claims 1 and 3 to more clearly recite certain aspects of the invention.

As discussed above, *Warren* does not teach or suggest that a switch, when actuated in response to an event, causes information retrieved from a vessel navigation system to be stored in memory and be associated with data that includes by-catch information. Furthermore, *Takiguchi* does not teach or suggest that a switch, when actuated in response to an event, causes information retrieved from a vessel navigation system to be stored in memory and be associated with data that includes by-catch information. Therefore, *Takiguchi* does not teach or suggest a modification to *Warren* that would yield a switch, when actuated in response to an event, causes information retrieved from a vessel navigation system to be stored in memory and be associated with data that includes by-catch information, as recited by claim 1. Therefore, the combination of *Warren* and *Takiguchi* does render claim 1 obvious.

Thus, the Applicant submits that claim 3, that depends from claim 1, is patentable over *Warren* in view of *Takiguchi*. Accordingly, the Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection be withdrawn.

35 U.S.C. §103 Claims 16-17

Claims 16-17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Squires* in further view of *Warren*. In response, the Applicant has amended claim 11 to more clearly recite certain aspects of the invention.

As discussed above, *Squires* does not teach or suggest associating date and vessel position with by-catch information relating to an event. Furthermore, *Warren* does not teach or suggest associating date and vessel position with by-catch information relating to an event. Therefore, *Warren* does not teach or suggest a modification to *Squires* that would result in associating date and vessel position with by-catch information relating to an event, as recited by claim 11. Therefore, the combination *Squires* and *Warren* does render claim 11 obvious.

Thus, the Applicant submits that claims 16-17, that depend from claim 11, are patentable over *Squires* in view of *Warren*. Accordingly, the Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection be withdrawn.

NEW CLAIMS 21-23

New claims 21-23 have been added to more clearly recite aspects of the invention. The Applicant submits that the new claims are fully supported by the specification and believes that no new matter has been added. Accordingly, the Applicants request allowance of these claims.

CONCLUSION

Thus, the Applicant submits that all claims now pending are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, both reconsideration of this application and swift passage to issue are earnestly solicited.

If the Examiner believes that any unresolved issues still exist, it is requested that the Examiner telephone Keith Taboada at (732) 530-9404 so that

RESPONSE TO OFFICE ACTION
Serial No. 10/822,012
Page 9 of 9

appropriate arrangements can be made for resolving such issues as expeditiously as possible.

Respectfully submitted,

Sept 21, 2002

Date


Keith P. TABOADA
Attorney Reg. No. 45,150
(732) 530-9404

Patterson & Sheridan, LLP
595 Shrewsbury Avenue
Suite 100
Shrewsbury, NJ 07702